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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a very interesting study and it is the first time I have seen such a study. It will add to the literature.

**Major compulsory revisions**

Nil

**Minor essential revisions**

1. After reading the paper I am still not clear on the curricular differences between UG and GEM programs in the early years. There is a difference in duration (18/12 GEM vs 24/12 UG) and there is a suggestion the PBL is used in GEM. Is the content significantly different. A reader needs this information to make sense of the results.

2. Examining the failures in each individual assessment necessitates 14 comparisons. Not unexpectedly some of the changes are statistically significant. There should be an adjustment to the level of significance for multiple comparisons - Bonferrosi or similar.

**Discretionary revisions**

3. I prefer statistical significance to statistical reliability

4. I prefer the use of the Chi symbol to writing it out.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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